

This letter is being submitted as WestFarm Foods comments regarding the above referenced draft permit.

WestFarm Foods has several milk processing facilities in the State of Washington (SIC 20XX). We are concerned about the added burden the draft permit will place on our industry and believe that burden is excessive. Specifically:

- Condition S4. requiring quarterly stormwater sampling, analysis and reporting is excessive. WestFarm Foods has facilities in California, Idaho and Oregon as well as Washington. Our California and Oregon facilities are required to sample and analyze stormwater, but only twice per year. Those two states also require reporting of those two sample results only once per year. Idaho which is permitted under the EPA Multisector Permit does not even require stormwater sampling.

Most of our facilities discharge to municipal stormwater conveyance systems. Therefore, we do not have the luxury of end of pipe sampling for the entire facility. Collecting samples from multiple drains on a quarterly schedule is burdensome and costly to our facilities.

Also, particularly in Eastern Washington, but even in Western Washington, an entire calendar quarter may not see any rain. Trying to catch that 1 or less scarce day of measurable rain during the dry season would be an effort in futility.

Therefore, we request that the sampling requirement in the draft permit be reduced to semi annually (Jan. – June and July – Dec.). Also, we request that the reporting of those 2-sampling events be combined into one annual report. We doubt that Ecology will respond or act on sample data more frequently than annually anyway.

- Condition S2.B.1. requires currently permitted facilities to submit a receiving water body form to Ecology by September 30, 2002. Our permitted facilities have submitted their StormWater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) to Ecology. Those SWPPP's identify the receiving water body. Condition S2.C.2. requires that a facility must submit a SWPPP within 30 days of receiving coverage. Therefore, we see no need to separately report the receiving water.
- In addition, 30 days to prepare and submit a SWPPP is not adequate. We request that the submittal due date be changed to 90 days. Retaining 30 days will result in facilities not meeting the due date or submitting inaccurate/incomplete SWPPP's.

- Condition S4. indicates that the permittee is not required to sample outside of regular business hours... During the workshop you (Keith Johnson) commented that a facility that operates 24 hours/day must also sample 24 hours/day. Our facilities operate 24 hours/day, but outside 7AM and 6PM only a skeleton crew is working on-site. Our Stormwater Pollution Prevention Teams consist of supervisory personnel that work most often between 7AM and 6PM. If they are on-site outside those hours it is because of some unusual circumstance that consumes 100% of their attention and it is not possible to take stormwater samples during those times.

Keith, you commented that industry has been very innovative in the past and you believe industry will find a way to sample during non-office hours, possibly automated samplers. Stormwater sampling from multiple drains, 1 hour after the start of the storm, after a 24 hour dry period is much more complex than automatic sampling of a continuous wastewater discharge. We don't think automated sampling is practical.

Therefore, we request that verbiage be added to the permit to spell out that "regular business hours" means "8AM to 5PM, Monday through Friday".

- Condition S4.D. requires facilities discharging to 303(d) listed waterbodies to test for "the parameters named on the 303(d) as causing impairment of the listed waters..." Many industrial facilities do not know where to access the 303(d) list to determine 1) if they do discharge to a 303(d) listed water and 2) to determine what additional testing parameters are required.

Therefore, to assist permittee's in complying with the permit, we request that, prior to December 31, 2002 Ecology notify all permittees that discharge to a 303(d) listed water body. Also a copy of the 303(d) list and the impaired parameters should be attached to the permit as an appendix. Also, if the list is available online the website should also be included.

- Finally, sections in this draft permit that pertain to compliance with water quality standards, mixing zones and discharges to impaired waterbodies are very confusing to those of us whose business is to process food. We are not stormwater experts and therefore hope that Ecology might better clarify those portions of the permit. We also are puzzled why this draft permit reportedly can apply to discharges to groundwater, while the Federal Clean Water Act, which we understand is what this permit is intended to enforce, only applies to discharges to surface water.

WestFarm Foods supports the Compliance Schedule in Condition S3.D.2. and encourages Ecology to retain it as written. WestFarm also agrees that the SWPPP need not be submitted to Ecology every time it is updated.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft permit. We hope Ecology will incorporate your requests.